

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

09/450,054 11/29/1999 ASHOK V. KRISHNAMOORTHY 32 7078 26291 7590 02/27/2003 MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN L.L.P. 595 SHREWSBURY AVE FIRST FLOOR JACKSON, CORNELIUS H	APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN L.L.P. 595 SHREWSBURY AVE EXAMINER	09/450,054		11/29/1999	ASHOK V. KRISHNAMOORTHY	32	7078
595 SHREWSBURY AVE	26291	75	590 02/27/2003			
LACKCON, CORNELLIO II				EXAMINER		
				JACKSON, CORNELIUS H		
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	SHREV	WSBURY	Y, NJ 07702		ARTINIT	DA DED MIMDED
						TATER NUMBER
2828				2828		
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003					DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		9800
,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/450,054	KRISHNAMOORTHY, ASHOK V.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cornelius H. Jackson	2828
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	pears on the cov rsh et with t	h correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e, cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed O) days will be considered timely. From the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	November 2002 and 23 Janua	<u>ary 2003</u> .
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	nis action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application	n.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		Paul De
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		PAUL IP
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800
Application Papers	ar	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable		Fyaminer
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re		,
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received in Appl	lication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price application from the International But See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest		
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pr 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	ovisional application has beer	n received.
Attachment(s)	, ,	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 Notice of Info	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/450,054

Art Unit: 2828

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Acknowledgment

- 1. Acknowledgment is made that applicant's Amendment, filed on 25 November 2002, has been considered. Upon entrance of the Amendment, claims 1, 7 and 10 were amended. Claims 1-11 are now pending in the current application.
- 2. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-5 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (5309001). Watanabe et al. disclose a network Fig. 12a for distributing a power signal in an optoelectronic circuit 350 comprising a plurality of electrically conductive pathways forming at least one level, wherein the portions of the conductive pathways are interconnected; a plurality of segments 353a-358b forming each level, wherein each segment of the level is equal in length; means for coupling

lines 49-51 and claim 1 above.

347/352 the power signal from a primary input to a point at the center of a first level; terminal nodes 359a-b coupled at the extremities of a last level for supplying the power signal to a device that form at least a portion of the optoelectronic circuit 350; and wherein the number of segments connecting the primary input to each of the terminal nodes is equal. Watanabe fail to teach that the network is used for supplying the power signal to a plurality of devices. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Regarding claim 2, Watanabe et al. disclose all stated limitations, see Figs. 12a.

Regarding claim 3, Watanabe et al. disclose all stated limitations, see Figs. 16.

Regarding claim 4, Watanabe et al. disclose all stated limitations, see col. 15,

Regarding claim 5, Watanabe et al. disclose the terminal nodes are optoelectronic devices, see col. 15, line 43-51 and claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 10-11, it is inherent that the device claimed operates, using method as claimed; therefore, the rejection of the device applies to the method as well.

5. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (5309001) as applied to claims 1-5 and 10-11 above, and further in view of Olbrightet al. (5266794)/Schneider et al. (5351256)/Lebby et al. (5337397). Watanabe et al. teach all of the stated limitations except for the integrated circuits are VCSELs; instead, Watanabe et al. teach the integrated circuits are LEDs. It is well known in the laser art that one may use either laser source (e.g. LED or VCSEL) as a

Application/Control Number: 09/450,054

Art Unit: 2828

Page 4

matter of obvious design choice, see Olbright et al. col. 8, lines 65-68/Schneider et al. col. 1, lines 14-16/ Lebby et al. col. 3, lines 17-27. Since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claims 7-9, Watanabe et al. teach all the stated limitations except for the plurality of electrically conductive pathways being separate; instead, Watanabe et al. teach the pathways being formed of wider/broader pathways that diverge as it branches to a higher level/order, see Figs. 5, 7, 9-10 and 18a and col. 9, line 54-col. 10, line 3, col. 11, line 11-col. 13, line 47 and col. 24, line 33-col. 26, line 20. It would have been an obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to separate the diverging wider/broader pathways into the individual pathways the wider/broader pathways eventually become, since the examiner takes Office Notice of the equivalence of the diverging wider/broader pathways and the plurality of separate pathways for their use in the electrical art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to improve the flow of current from a primary source to multiple regions would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cornelius H. Jackson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5981. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 5:00, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

February 23, 2003

PAUL IP

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800